

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

D.S.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, et
al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:22-cv-00246-JCM-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 58]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to compel. Docket No. 58. Discovery motions will not be considered "unless the movant (1) has made a good faith effort to meet and confer . . . before filing the motion, and (2) includes a declaration setting forth the details and results of the meet-and-confer conference about each disputed discovery request." Local Rule 26-7(c). "[T]his requirement may only be satisfied through direct dialogue and discussion in a face-to-face meeting, telephone conference, or video conference. The exchange of written, electronic, or voice-mail communications does not satisfy this requirement." Local Rule IA 1-3(f). The instant motion does not include a certification as to any face-to-face meeting, telephone conference, or video conference. *See* Docket No. 58-1. Accordingly, the motion to compel is **DENIED** without prejudice.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 20, 2023


Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ This issue has been percolating in written communications for several months. And, yet, Plaintiff asks for expedited review given upcoming deadlines. *See* Docket No. 58 at 2. It is not clear from the papers that expedited treatment is appropriate. *Cf. Cardoza v. Bloomin' Brands, Inc.*, 141 F. Supp. 3d 1137, 1143 (D. Nev. 2015) (recognizing that emergency motions "are not intended to save the day for parties who have failed to present requests when they should have").